REMARKS

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 are pending and stand rejected.

Therefore, claims 1-6, 8-13 and 15-20 are now presented for consideration.

No new matter is presented by the claim amendments, accordingly, entry and approval of same are submitted to be proper and are respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed June 3, 2003 at page 2, item 2, claims 1-6, 8-13, and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,898,756) in view of Rosen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,607) and further in view of Bulfer (U.S. Patent No. 6,208,966).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner contends, in the Advisory Action mailed October 23, 2003 that:

> "[a]s to the issue of 'severely attenuating' signals and 'disconnecting,' while the methods are not exactly the same, as noted in the previous office action [mailed June 3, 2003], the purpose and end result are (sic) the same" (brackets added).

Applicants submit that the end result (i.e., the operation of the Manning et al. parallel-connected device is not the same as that of the present invention recited, for example, in claim 1. According to the present invention recited in claim 1 "a signal transmission inhibition unit ... selectively blocks transmission of the DTMF command signal, completely, from the telephone unit to the telephone network and allows transmission of the DTMF command signal directly to the data processing device when the DTMF command signal indicates one of the plurality of telephone services"

Thus, in the present invention recited in claim 1 it is possible to ensure that the DTMF command signal sent from the telephone unit and indicating one of the plurality of telephone services is not transmitted from the telephone unit (i.e., the sending-side user) of the

communication support system to any telephone unit (i.e., the receiving-side ser) over the public switched telephone network.

The effect of the Manning et al. parallel-connected device is "to severely attenuate signals sent between the telephones 30, 32 and the central office 5 ... [with] a series connected capacitor C1 and resistor R1 ... [providing] a low impedance path between tip and ring." (See Manning et al. at column 4, lines 23-28.) Further, the disclosure of Manning et al. specifically teaches that "the length of the cable and telephone wiring connecting the dialer to the path between the off-hook phone and the central telephone office does affect the attenuation, since a longer path generates higher resistance and lower attenuation. (See Manning et al. at column 5, line 57 to 61.) This means that the attenuation in the Manning device is dependent on operating conditions (i.e., the length of the cable and telephone wiring connecting the dialer to the path between the off-hook phone and the central telephone office). Contrary to the present invention of claim 1, Manning cannot "selectively block transmission of the DTMF command signal, completely," and depending on operating conditions may not be able to even severely attenuate such signals because the structure of the Manning device a low impedance is provided between the tip and ring.

Further, in the Manning et al. transmission-inhibiting device, to determine whether a DTMF command signal sent from the telephone network is detected is not possible, because Manning et al. does not disclose or suggest any difference between the telephone unit and the telephone network connected to the transmission-inhibiting device.

Rosen et al. discloses a computer system which communicates "between the PIU-connected telephones 104 and 108 and the computer system 100 ... through radio frequency (RF) communication between the PIUs 106 and 110 and the CIU 102 over the internal telephone network line 130. ... When a PIU-connected telephone is initially picked up, the PIU supplies power to the telephone instead of the phone company 134 and thus prevents the telephone from seizing the telephone network line 130. This effectively isolates the telephone from the external phone line 128, allowing the telephone to communicate with the CIU 102 by RF carrier signals sent over line 130. When the non-PIU telephone 114 is picked up, the CIU 102 turns off its carrier signal to force all telephones to revert to ordinary telephone operation." (See Rosen et al. at column 4, line 58 to column 5, line 6.)

Accordingly, Rosen et al. does not disclose or suggest "to selectively disconnect the telephone network from either of the telephone unit or the data processing device" and furthermore, does not disclose or suggest "a signal transmission inhibition unit including a switch connected between the telephone network and either the telephone unit or the data processing device to switch therebetween ... and selectively blocks transmission of the DTMF command signal, completely, from the telephone unit to the telephone network and allows transmission of the DTMF command signal directly to the data processing device when the DTMF command signal indicates one of the plurality of telephone services" (as recited in claim 1). This is because the Rosen et al. system uses RF carrier signals sent over the network line 130 (see, for example, Fig. 1). Thus, the Rosen et al. telephone network is not switched between either the telephone unit or the data processing device, as the Rosen et al. system merely uses the existing telephone network line 130 but prevents the telephone from seizing the telephone network line 130.

Bulfer, which is directed to "telecommunications network service for converting spoken words to individual DTMF signals" (see Bulfer at column 2, lines 25-27), does not suggest anything related to the above-mentioned distinguishing features recited in claim 1.

Accordingly, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited art taken singularly or in any proper combination for at least the above noted reasons and is submitted to be allowable.

Claims 10, 16-20 patentably distinguish over the cited art for reasons similar to those of claim 1 and are also submitted to be allowable.

Claims 2-6, 8-9, 11-13 and 15, which depend from claims 1 and 10, are submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as those of claims 1 and 10, as well as for the additional recitations therein.

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/26/03

By: Eric Berkowitz
Registration No. 44,030

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501